

functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.4, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the inventions I and II are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects since invention II uses both a continuous beam of accelerated electrons and pulses of accelerated electrons to polymerize a polymerizable composition whereas invention I uses only pulses of accelerated electrons.

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the inventions I and III are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects since method of invention III produces a pressure-sensitive article versus a polymer coated substrate of invention I.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the inventions II and III they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects since invention II uses both a continuous beam of accelerated electrons and pulses of accelerated electrons to polymerize a polymerizable composition whereas invention III uses only pulses of accelerated electrons."

Notwithstanding that the Groups I, II, and III claims may not be capable of use together and may have different modes of operation, functions, and effects, Applicants submit the inventions are so interrelated that a search of one group of claims will reveal art to the others, especially because they are all in the same class. The classification of Groups I, II, and III claims in different subclasses is not sufficient grounds to require restriction.

Were restriction to be effected between the claims in Groups I, II, and III, a separate examination of the claims in Groups I, II, and III would require substantial duplication of work on the part of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Even though some additional consideration would be necessary, the scope of analysis of novelty of all the claims of Groups I, II and III would have to be as rigorous as when only the claims of Group I were being considered by themselves. Clearly, this duplication of effort would not be warranted where these claims are so interrelated. Further, Applicants submit that for restriction to be effected between the claims in Groups I, II, and III, it would place an undue burden on Applicants' assignee by requiring payment of a separate

INTEL PROP 220 10W

651 736 6133

08/25/03 14:31 :04/05 NO:448

Application No.: 09/853217

Case No.: 55944US002

filling fee for examination of the nonelected claims, as well as the added costs associated with prosecuting three applications and maintaining three patents.

Registration Number 41,792	Telephone Number 651-736-6432
Date December 6 2002	

Respectfully submitted,

By Melanie Gover
Melanie Gover

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
P.O. Box 33427
St. Paul, Minnesota 55133-3427
Facsimile: (651) 736-3833